

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application.

The Examiner objected to the specification for numerous informalities.

Applicants have amended the specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions set forth on pages 2-3 of the Office Action dated April 20, 2005.

Additionally, the Examiner asserts that the formulas at page 1, line 19 and page 11, line 16 of the specification appear without explanation. Neither of the formulas pointed out by the Examiner require any explanation as the formulas do not contain any variables. Accordingly, Applicants submit that there is no ambiguity in the formulas that requires correction.


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Claims 1-6 have been objected to for informalities.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4 and 5 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Furuhashi et al., WO 00/37973 ("Furuhashi") (which according to the Examiner is the equivalent of U.S. Patent No. 6,552,849).

The Examiner asserts that Furuhashi teaches a dye represented by the following formula:



In the formula, the dye contains a phenyl group having a sulfophenyl group substituted by a hydroxyl group.

However, Applicants submit that there is no examples disclosed in Furuhashi that contains a phenyl group having a sulfophenyl group substituted by a hydroxyl group. The closest example to the present invention that is disclosed in Furuhashi is a dye in which “A” (of Applicants’ formula I) is a 4-sulfophenyl, “R<sup>1</sup>” is a hydrogen atom, and “R<sup>2</sup>” is a hydrogen atom, which is disclosed in Furuhashi’s Example 1, which corresponds to Comparative Example 1 in the present application.

The present invention is illustrated in Examples 1 and 2 of the specification. The results in Table 1 on page 11 of the specification demonstrate that the present invention provides excellent light resistance as compared with a compound illustrated in Comparative Example 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the present invention would not be anticipated by or obvious over Furuhashi. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 4 has been objected to as allegedly being dependent on a rejected base claim.

Appln. No.: 10/642,193  
Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Based on the above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over Furuhashi. Accordingly, claim 4 is not dependent on a rejected base claim and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Jennifer R. Leach  
Registration No. 54,257

Date: July 20, 2005